

REMARKS

These Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed April 1, 2002.

Claims 1-15 were pending in the Application prior to the outstanding Office Action. In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-5, 7, and 9-15, and objected to claims 6 and 8. The present Response leaves for the Examiner's present consideration claims 1-15. Reconsideration of the rejections is requested.

ELECTION/RESTRICTION

During a phone conversation with Examiner on December 26, 2001, a provisional election was made without traverse to prosecute the invention of Group I, claims 1-15. Applicant hereby affirms the election of Group I, claims 1-15. Applicant believes that no change in inventorship is required as a result of this election.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS

Examiner stated claims 6 and 8 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant thanks the Examiner for this determination and has rewritten claims 6 and 8 in independent form to include the limitations of their respective base claims and any intervening claims. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 6 and 8 are now in condition for allowance.

RESPONSE TO REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC §103

The Claimed Invention Distinguishes Over Dryer

The Examiner rejected claims 1-5, 7, and 9 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Dryer, D.C., "Ghosts in the Machine: Personalities for Socially Adroit Software Agents", Proc. Socially Intelligent

Agents Workshop, Cambridge, MA, November 8-10, 1997, 31 pages ("Dryer"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection based on Dryer.

Dryer discloses the results of a laboratory study that investigated user response to software agents with personalities. The author assessed the personality of the user, user perception of the characters with different personality factors, and whether the user liked the characters. Dryer then derived at conclusions based on user response to the characters (page 33, left column, second paragraph).

Dryer does not disclose a system for designing personalities having a personality trait selection device and personality builder as claimed in claim 1. Dryer discloses how a group of users responded to a software agent used in connection with a specific application, but does not disclose anything about a system for creating the software agent. Dryer relates to an experiment for receiving responses regarding software agents with different personality factors. Dryer does not disclose or suggest any method or system for designing the personalities of synthetic characters. Therefore, Dryer does not teach, hint, or suggest the invention as claimed in independent claim 1, or dependent claims 2-7, which directly or indirectly depend from the independent claims.

Claim 2 further distinguishes from Dryer. Dryer does not disclose or suggest a personality builder that weights each selected personality trait in a character profile according to the amount of each selected personality trait represented in the corresponding trait indicator as claimed in claim 2. Unlike the invention as claimed in claim 2, Dryer does not disclose any methodology for weighting, combining, or otherwise implementing multiple personality traits that may have been present in an animated character. Therefore, Dryer does not teach, hint, or suggest the invention as claimed in dependent claim 2, or dependent claims 3-6, which directly or indirectly depend from the independent claims.

Dryer does not disclose or suggest rendering at least one behavior of a synthetic character based on a character profile having selected personality traits as claimed in 9. Dryer discloses how a group of users

responded to a software agent used in connection with a specific application. Dryer does not disclose or suggest any method or system for rendering a personality of a synthetic character, wherein a behavior is rendered based on a character profile having selected personality traits. Therefore, Dryer does not teach, hint, or suggest the invention as claimed in independent claim 9, or dependent claims 10-15, which directly or indirectly depend from the independent claims.

The Claimed Invention Distinguishes Over Dryer in view of Blumberg et al.

The Examiner rejected claims 10-12 and 14-15 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Dryer in view of Blumberg et.al., "Multi-Level Direction of Automonous Creatures for Real-Time Virtual Environments", Proc. 22nd Annual International Conference on Computer Graphics and Interactive Techniques, 1995, p. 47-54 ("Blumberg et al."). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection based on Dryer in view of Blumberg.

Blumberg et al. discloses a behavior system that receives internal variables, releasing mechanisms, and level of interest data to determine the control of a character (Figure 6, p. 51, Section 6.1). Blumberg et al. does not disclose or suggest specifying a trait indicative behavior and implementing behaviors consistent with the trait indicative behavior as claimed in claim 10. The system of Blumberg et al. receives non-behavior related data such as releasing mechanism data and internal variable data. Blumberg et al. does not disclose specifying a trait indicative behavior and implementing behaviors consistent with the specified trait indicative behavior. Therefore, Dryer in view of Blumberg et al. does not disclose the invention as claimed in claim 10, or claim 11 which is dependant upon claim 10.

As discussed above, claim 9 is neither disclosed or suggested in view of Dryer. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 10-12 and 14-15 are distinguishable as being dependent on an allowable independent claim.

The Claimed Invention Distinguishes Over Dryer in view of Rousseau et al.

The Examiner rejected claim 13 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Dryer in view of Rousseau et al.'s "Improvisational Synthetic Actors with Flexible Personalities", Knowledge Systems Laboratory Technical Report No. KSL-97-10, December 1997 ("Rousseau et al."). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection based on Dryer in view of Rousseau et al.

Rousseau et al. discloses a social-psychological model that distinguishes personality traits, moods, and attitudes. Personality traits are patterns of behavior and modes of thinking that determine a person's adjustment to the environment that change little over time. Moods correspond to emotions or sensations due to physical need that vary over time. Attitudes characterize an interpersonal relationship that may develop over time (page 9, Section 4). As discussed above, Dryer does not disclose or suggest a method of rendering a personality comprising rendering a behavior of a synthetic character based on a character profile having a selected personality trait as claimed in claim 9. Further, Rousseau et al. does not disclose or suggest rendering a behavior of a synthetic character based on a character profile having a selected personality trait as claimed in claim , where rendering includes modulating an existing behavior based on the character profile. Therefore, Dryer in view of Rousseau et al. does not disclose the invention as claimed in claim 13.

The references cited by the Examiner but not relied upon have been reviewed, but are not believed to render the claims unpatentable, either individually or in combination.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and a Notice of Allowance is requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 7/1/02

By: Stephen R. Bachmann
Stephen R. Bachmann
Reg. No. 50,806

FLIESLER DUBB MEYER & LOVEJOY LLP
Four Embarcadero Center, Fourth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-4156
Telephone: (415) 362-3800

APPENDIX

What is claimed is:

6. (Amended) [The system according to Claim 2, further comprising] A system for designing personalities for synthetic characters, comprising:

a personality trait selection device that displays at least one selectable personality trait, said personality trait selection device comprises at least one trait indicator, each trait indicator representing an amount of a corresponding one of the selectable personality traits;

a personality builder that groups the selected personality traits into a character profile, said personality builder weights each selected personality trait in said character profile according the amount of each selected personality trait represented in the corresponding trait indicator;

a trait indicative behavior selection device that displays at least one selectable trait indicative behavior; and

a mapper configured to map each selected trait indicative behavior into amounts of the trait indicators according to an amount each selected personality attribute is represented in the selectable personality traits.

8. (Amended) [The system according to Claim 1, further comprising] A system for designing personalities for synthetic characters, comprising:

a personality trait selection device that displays at least one selectable personality trait;

a personality builder that groups the selected personality traits into a character profile; and

a physical modification device configured to modify physical characteristics of said synthetic character based on the character profile.